

25¢

MARCH 1956

Social Action

A Magazine of Christian Concern



HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

CHRISTIAN ACCENT ON FREEDOM

Ray Gibbons

Social Action

Vol. XXII, No. 7

March 1956

CONTENTS

Editorial	3
Christian Accent on Freedom By Ray Gibbons	7
Book Notes By Frank D. Dorey	22
Christian Faith and Freedom By Fern Babcock	24
Workshop	28

COVER: A drawing by Chester Tanaka.

SOCIAL ACTION is published monthly except July and August by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches and by the Commission on Christian Social Action of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y. Myron W. Fowell and Elmer J. F. Arndt, Chairmen, Ray Gibbons and Huber F. Klemme, Directors, respectively.

Re-entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at New York, N.Y.

F. Ernest Johnson
Editor

Elizabeth Henley
Assistant to the Editor

Editorial Board

A. William Loos
Chairman

Mrs. Charles E. Bingham

Richard M. Fagley

Ray Gibbons

Huber F. Klemme

Albert J. Penner

Herman F. Reissig

Charles H. Seaver

Subscription, \$2.00 per year.

Single copy, 25¢.

*Copyright, 1956, by the
Council for Social Action.*

Editorial

"Right-to-Work" Laws

No controversial question that is engaging public attention better illustrates the conflict in Christian ethical thinking than the issue over so-called "right-to-work" laws. Large groups of equally conscientious Christians appraise them in quite contradictory ways. So sharp is the contrast that people on each side of the argument ask how one can possibly be a Christian and defend the opposing position.

The heart of the matter is, of course, the principle involved in the union shop: the requirement that a person belong to a union in order to obtain permanent employment in a given establishment. Is it right, under any circumstances, many people ask indignantly, to deny an individual employment for which a prospective employer is ready to take him on? What possible justification can there be in a free society for allowing a union to prevent an employer from hiring whomever he chooses?

Put in that bold fashion, these questions seem to answer themselves. Those who defend union shop agreements—and therefore oppose the "right-to-work" laws—could not state their position by simply answering the first question in the affirmative. Nor could they state their case by answering the second question as it stands. The most serious issues that divide people arise out of inability to agree on how the basic questions should be put.

So long as one thinks in terms of

individual "rights" he can make a case against the progressive income tax, compulsory automobile insurance, even compulsory vaccination. And what a case he can make against price fixing and rationing with respect to food! Or against an anti-discrimination law that prevents a hotel or restaurant owner from choosing his own patrons! No, whatever justice may require, it cannot be arrived at by putting a complex issue in oversimplified terms.

The real issue over the union shop involves the answering of questions that arise out of changed conditions which affect the parties to a work contract. If one rejects unionism and collective bargaining on general principles then the matter is indeed simple. But once the union-management contract is taken for granted in industry there are two corporate entities involved in all labor problems — not merely individuals and a corporation. And where the contractual relationship is genuine and responsible on both sides the union is accorded and accepts responsibility for furnishing labor, as management provides the tools and raw materials. It is in this context that the union shop must be appraised. To recognize this does not settle the matter but it should make it discussible.

Defying the Court

A further illustration, and an ominous one, of the contrary ways in which Christian consciences actually operate is furnished by the

determined efforts in some of the Southern states to evade the Supreme Court ruling on segregation in the schools. In Virginia the voters have decided by more than a two-to-one majority to amend the state constitution so as to permit the grant of public funds to parents for tuition in private schools. It appears that such grants will be available both to parents in communities that close their public schools in order to avoid integration and to parents who decline to comply with the desegregation plan when a community adopts it.

It is safe to say that large numbers of persons who voted that way are to be found on Sunday in Virginia's churches and see no violence to Christian ethics in race discrimination. They have never realized that Christianity is a revolutionary force which changes not only men but institutions.

Others among these pro-segregation Christians are no doubt troubled in conscience because they cannot bring themselves to the point of breaking with what in their secret hearts they nonetheless believe to be wrong.

And how are we to understand the Christian citizens of Alabama who in the House of Representatives or as members of the public which supports its action have defied the highest judicial tribunal in the nation? The House has declared the Supreme Court's decision as "null, void and of no effect." This is about as close to insurrection as anything short of violence can be. Yet we have no doubt there are many Americans, in the North as

well as in the South, who support this political rebellion without any conscious violation of Christian principles. How vague and ineffectual our Christian sanctions can be when human passions are grievously aroused!

The cloud has a silver lining in that many of the people who are resisting the authority of the national government are no doubt actuated by fear of going too fast along a road which they expect eventually to travel. If it is Christian to build a universal brotherhood it is also Christian to recognize and acknowledge that time may be required to overcome human selfishness and pride.

"Executives and Ethics"

This is the title of an article by Melvin H. Baker, Chairman of the Board, National Gypsum Company, in *Dun's Review and Modern Industry* for January. It is inspired by what the writer calls an assault on business men by novelists and by television and movie writers. He notes that contemporary business leaders are not being attacked as sharply as some of their forebears. "None of the villains are cast in the unlovely mold of a Daniel Drew, a Jay Gould, or a Jim Fisk. . . . Nobody is bludgeoning striking employees or trying to buy off state legislatures."

The current line is quite different. "The action revolves around ambitions, devious or direct, for pre-ferment, or maybe just to keep what they've got. Somebody wins, somebody loses, and perhaps the loser dies of a coronary. And maybe the

winner loses more in the end because he appears headed toward losing his soul." To this sort of indictment Mr. Baker objects.

"It seems to me," he says, "that the target of the writers is nothing more than the same old strenuous competition which business men in this country have always accepted as healthy. True, it is also a process of screening out the unqualified.

"But is this ruthless, when the most important by-product of competition is efficiency — which alone makes possible the production of goods and services for a mass market at popular prices, and which, incidentally, creates more jobs? Isn't this competition the living tissue of our free enterprise system?"

Mr. Baker concedes defects in business and in business executives, but he regards the apparent crudities of competition as inevitable accompaniments of the competitive process which, however, character and discipline can tame and religion can measurably redeem.

"Chiseling" for the Church

A startling article appears in *Protestant Church Administration and Equipment* (Winter, 1956) charging that some disreputable practices are resorted to in securing church support. The writer, C. Harvey Atkinson, begins with this:

"To their deep shame, churches— which by their mission and nature should be setting high standards of moral and ethical conduct in all relationships — are continually and embarrassingly guilty of what is popularly (or unpopularly) known as 'chiseling.' "

These "pious chiselers" try to get discounts and concessions when making purchases for the church, employing "procedures which no business organization of repute would condone." The writer relates a conversation with a merchant who reluctantly admitted, when pressed to speak of it, that he had submitted to unreasonable and embarrassing demands rather than run the risk of being "boycotted" by church people.

We have no way of knowing how extensive such practices are. The writer of the article does not maintain that they are typical. But any of this sort of thing is too much. Can some of our readers throw light on this matter?

Advertise Industrial Peace?

A high official of the AFL-CIO has complained that the newspapers feature strike news to an extent that is all out of proportion to its statistical importance. He says they "totally ignore numerous peaceful settlements" reached in the neighborhoods where their readers live, and "headline a strike that takes place 1000 miles away." He insists that 98 per cent of the quarter-million labor contracts signed each year by union and management representatives are negotiated without strikes. Why do the papers pay so little attention to them?

We think the question very nearly answers itself. Since the newspapers are primarily newspapers it is not strange that thousands of thoroughly commonplace events should go unnoticed. One might perhaps imagine a benign nature lover com-

plaining that the newspapers are always on the alert for nature's tantrums, giving unlimited space to big storms, but making no effort to remind people of the abundance of balmy days. As long as the question is one of *news*, the more peace there is in industry the less it is likely to be talked about.

But this is not the whole of it. The labor spokesman just quoted proposes that the newspapers publish a "daily or weekly box score," showing how the number of peacefully negotiated agreements compares with the number of strikes. The *New York Times*, while not ready to plead "guilty as charged" on behalf of the press, thinks the proposal a good one and suggests that AFL-CIO keep such a tally and furnish it to the press several times a year.

This is a proposal that the newspapers play a role in relation to industrial peace that is in the area, not of mere "news" reporting, but of social responsibility. To a degree that is often overlooked our great newspapers are engaged in just this kind of journalism. That is to say, they feel a moral responsibility not only to report the news but to point up what is socially significant in the news.

Conversely, it would be of great assistance to a responsible press if the parties to all manner of conflicts should undertake in their public relations to subordinate propaganda to candid statement and fair analysis, especially when preparing the releases with which they bombard the press.

An Ill-Conceived Proposal

The President has been called on by William L. McGrath, employer delegate to the International Labor Organization, to end all U.S. participation in the ILO, according to a story in the *New York Times*. He contends that the representation in the organization of employers and employees—as distinct from government—is wholly fictitious in the case of Iron Curtain countries. We think the comment on Mr. McGrath's proposal which appears in *The Yardstick* (National Catholic Welfare Conference) both sober and wise:

The National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce are naturally opposed to the seating of phony employer and worker delegates in the ILO. So are President Eisenhower and members of the U.S. delegation to the ILO. And so is the U.S. labor delegate. As we have noted in earlier columns on this subject, they all agree with Mr. McGrath that the so-called employer and worker delegates from Iron Curtain countries are nothing more than stooges for their respective Communist governments, that they are not entitled to be accredited to an organization which operates on the principle of a three-way (government, employer and employee) representation. The trouble is that Mr. McGrath's proposed solution to this problem would only make matters worse.

Withdrawal from the ILO—which neither the NAM nor the Chamber of Commerce seems to have endorsed—would play directly into the hands of the communists.

We have taken pleasure in placing on our masthead the name of Miss Elizabeth Henley as Assistant to the Editor. Miss Henley brings to the magazine experience, resourcefulness, and discriminating judgment.

The churches have a unique contribution to make to the improvement of our civil liberties and the protection of our national security because of their Christian faith and heritage. This post-McCarthyism period is an opportune time for some sober second-thought about this problem. "Christian Faith and Freedom" is the name of the program the Council for Social Action prepared with the help of a grant from the Fund for the Republic, to promote the discussion of civil liberties issues in the churches, beginning March 1. The following article is a part of the materials prepared for this purpose.

Christian Accent on Freedom

By Ray Gibbons

"WE AS Americans are in danger of losing two of our most vital possessions—our personal freedom and our national security!" These are the opening words of the leaflet announcing the program of the Council for Social Action on "Christian Faith and Freedom, an Inquiry into the Bearing of Christian Faith upon Our Civil Liberties." Are these words to be taken seriously? Are they only words to scare people? Is there any truth in the allegation that our civil liberties are in danger?

You, the reader, can answer. Have you been considered for a government position and undergone a security check? Have you served as a reference for some person whose loyalty has been investigated by the F.B.I.? Have you applied for a passport that was long delayed in arriving? Have teachers you know been questioned by school officials or

others about their loyalty, their membership in organizations, their textbooks, or their opinions on social issues? Has anyone attempted to discredit you by circulating information secured from the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee or a parallel state organization? Have you been called subversive because you championed a cause which has been supported also by some fellow-traveler group? Have you been questioned about your past affiliations, the petitions you signed, or meetings you co-sponsored? Have you been called a "controversial" figure because of your outspoken position on race relations, immigration legislation, or some other social issue?

Improved Climate of Opinion

Your response to these questions may be, "So what? I have no objection to security checks, Congression-

al committee investigations, or the files on some ten million Americans. What really counts is the over-all, long-run improvement in civil liberties and the extension of American freedom." Such a view of the situation has much to support it. More people have a chance at education, jobs, voting than was true in the last century. We have extended the boundaries of the Bill of Rights to include freedom to learn; that is, "academic freedom." We are asking what freedom means for new areas of communication such as the motion picture, radio, and television. We certainly have been using our freedom to move our place of residence and to travel. We continue to use our right to affiliate with organizations of our own choice — even though more circumspectly.

While there has been no change of rules for Congressional committees, some have voluntarily improved their practices. McCarthyism is no longer rampant. Congress has appointed a new sub-committee on Constitutional Rights, chaired by Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, which has been holding hearings. Congress also authorized a bi-partisan commission to study the government's loyalty-security program and report before December 31, 1956. The commission members have been appointed and the commission has begun to work. The courts have continued to give strong support to the Bill of Rights and have helped to keep the ship of state upon an even keel through the recent stormy waters. Is there then any cause for alarm about our civil liberties?

Continuing Threats to Freedom

The world situation, however, has not changed fundamentally. There could again be a frustrating event like the Korean war. We still live in a precarious world in which two giant powers hold in their hands the weapons for mass destruction. Mutual terror may prevent major warfare; but smaller, "brush-fire" wars may be kindled at any time in such combustible areas as the Middle East or Southeast Asia. The "Geneva smile" quickly vanished, and the "hundred years of cold war" continues; so there is no cessation of the underlying anxiety. As long as there is threat of communist power seeking world control, using intrigue, subversion, and conspiracy, there will be anxiety about security, both for the free world and for our own country.

There are also increasing pressures upon our freedom from our technological society. President Howard R. Bowen of Grinnell College put it this way:

Modern technology has caused, and made possible, the proliferation of large organizations. We are part of a human race which is now counted in billions, we are citizens of populous nations, we belong to armies numbering in the millions, we work for corporations with tens of thousands of workers and stockholders, we belong to unions and farm organizations whose numbers run into the millions. We go to universities with tens of thousands of students.

For many purposes large organizations are more useful and effective than small ones. But the scope for freedom of the mind, for assertion of human individuality, is far less in a world of great organizations than in a world of small-scale or face-to-face groups. In a society like ours, the pressure to conform is overwhelming. We simply can't tolerate

individualistic nonsense from the man on the assembly line, or even from the big executive in the main office. If the organization is to run smoothly, the individual must fit in, he must conform, he must subordinate himself to its needs.

In a society which sets such a high premium on being "sociable" and "getting along well with others" there will be fewer and fewer persons willing to "stick their necks out" or stand up for their own opinions against the pressure of others.

Why a Concern for Civil Liberties Now?

Is this the time to study civil liberties? Has the time passed when it is important? The answer is that the struggle to preserve and extend civil liberties must be carried on in every generation, every decade, and every day. Each generation has to wage its own battle, for eternal vigilance is still the price of freedom. Freedom is not something you can store away in a vault for safekeeping. It is a crop which must be planted, cultivated, and harvested. Furthermore, when emotion runs high, as it did in the heyday of McCarthyism, it is difficult to get people to study and think rationally about the problem. The emotional atmosphere in 1956 is far more conducive to sober second thought. Now is the opportune time to take a careful look at the situation and take long steps ahead.

There is a special reason why the churches should pay close attention to civil liberties in a period of comparative calm. They have an essential contribution to make in this field. Many persons assume that if

we know the Constitution and the Bill of Rights we shall be able to deal with the issues of civil liberties as they arise. Undoubtedly we need to know better the protections of human rights contained in these basic documents. But that is not sufficient for us as Christians. We must also turn to our Bibles and American church history. It is the Christian faith that gives life and vitality to our freedom. The government can do much to protect our freedom but what it does depends upon the sanctions of its citizens; and what the citizens approve depends upon their basic faith. It was the faith nourished in large part by the Bible and the Reformation that gave rise to our American civil liberties. It will be through the refreshment and challenge of the Christian faith that these liberties will now be reborn in our hearts, our actions, and our institutions.

Scylla and Charybdis

Threats to civil liberties come from both the "right" and the "left." Certain rightist organizations stress a kind of freedom which adds up to freedom from governmental regulation of the economy. They object to social security, the graduated income tax, and governmental measures to maintain full employment. A free economy is an integral part of American freedom, but it does not mean that the government must abandon its useful function of regulating and stabilizing the economy.

There are other groups more extreme which feed on their hate for Jews, Negroes, "liberals," and foreigners. Freedom means to them the

power to control the lives of others and to dominate their thoughts, their speech, and their actions. Such groups do not believe that people can be trusted with civil liberties.

The danger from the left is more evident. We know that communism is a world-wide movement directed by the Politburo and that it reaches into nearly every country. Our government has enacted legislation and established the F.B.I. and other agencies to investigate and punish such activities. But there is also an effort to win control of voluntary organizations and here alert members can thwart such efforts by insisting upon democratic practices and full information for the membership. They have also used civil liberties as a pretext to confuse issues and win public support. In the name of civil liberties they seek the power to destroy civil liberties. Should loyal citizens cease discussing civil liberties for this reason? The Constitution and the Bill of Rights existed long before there was a "Communist Manifesto" or a Communist Party. Before any of these there were the Bible and the Reformation. Should we be deterred from attention to our basic tradition and the solution of crucial national prob-

lems because good words are misused? Surely we can steer a course between Scylla on the right and Charybdis on the left.

Freedom for Whom?

Freedom is an indivisible fabric. A nation cannot exist half slave and half free; neither can a culture. Business is free when labor is free and both are free when the consumer has freedom of choice. There is freedom for the well-to-do when it is secure for the disadvantaged; for the young when it is provided for the elderly. Pull any strand of this fabric and the others are seriously weakened. Free enterprise depends upon freedom in other parts of the culture—schools, churches, and government. Freedom of religion depends upon civil liberty. A free church cannot thrive in a totalitarian society nor can free society prosper when the churches are repressed. Cultural, religious, economic, and political freedoms are so interwoven that each strengthens the other and damage to any weakens all. The freedom of each is enhanced when it is secure for the most vulnerable groups—children, racial minorities, and the economically disadvantaged.

I. Our Christian Heritage

It is important for Christians to understand the sources whence their freedoms come. The first is the Bible. As Charles Turner of Duxbury declared in his Election Sermon of 1773: "The Scriptures cannot be rightfully expounded without explaining them in a manner friendly to the cause of liberty."

Similarly, another Election Sermon preacher of 1761 stated: "Liberty both civil and religious is the spirit and genius of the sacred writings."

There are sources of the liberal spirit in the New Testament. Mary Ely Lyman points out that the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles present "the

newly enacted drama of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ [as] an act of freedom and of pioneering faith, unique and determining for all the future of the Christian faith. Jesus released a 'new and explosive force' which challenged the old religious legalism with a religion of the heart. This 'newness and freedom' characterized the first-century Christian community."

Christ Sets Us Free

The writing of Paul, especially his letter to the Galatians, has been called the Christian's Charter of Freedom. "For freedom did Christ set us free," he wrote. "Stand fast therefore, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage." "Here is the essential and characteristic note of Pauline Christianity," writes Mrs. Lyman.

The Christian is free—free from the bondage of the law, free from sin, and guilt, free from the warring within his members—free from death—brought by the Spirit of Christ into "the liberty of the glory of the children of God" (Romans 8:21). This freedom is dependent upon an inward and spiritual condition, and is hence universal. . . . The freedom of the Christian man in Christ Jesus is Paul's most characteristic gift to all Christian thinking since his time.

New Testament Freedom

This inward experience of Christ which sets one free from sin and the fear of death is not, of course, what we mean by civil liberty. It is, however, one of the springs from whence civil liberty flows. Christians who knew that "if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36) were concerned

that others might have the experience which they so highly prized. They were disposed to resist any power which obstructed such free access to Christ, whether it was the state or public opinion. So Peter and the apostles declared to the council, "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). Such appeal to the sovereignty of God justified their conscientious objection and gave it universal validity. Through the ages Christians have not defended such rights for others, especially the heretics, as they have for themselves; but had they not stoutly defended their own religious liberty they would not have come to see it was important for others, especially for those in the minority who could not defend themselves.

Another New Testament teaching contributed to the later development of civil liberty. Man's essential freedom is not the ultimate authority, for it may itself be misused, and such misuse of freedom is sin. It is God who judges man and his use of his God-given freedom. So Paul writes: "But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment: yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing against myself; yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord" (I Corinthians 4:3-4). Throughout the Bible this judgment falls upon the nation as well as the individual. All men are sinners. This Biblical insight gave strong support to the later Christians who sought legally constituted protections against sinful rulers on behalf of sinful people. Unless a man's freedom to be wrong is safe-

guarded he is not free to be right, for God, not other men, is his judge. Civil liberty was seen to be a condition favorable to the growth of freedom among sinful humanity.

The New Testament emphasis upon love and community is another important source of later concepts of civil liberty. As Paul wrote, "Brethren, ye have been called unto liberty: only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another" (Galatians 5:13). Freedom was not only an individual possession; it was the possession of persons in community. The justification for its possession is that it is necessary to the fulfillment of persons who realize their destiny in community. As Dr. F. Ernest Johnson has said, "No one is free who has not learned that love is the fulfilling of the law."

The Reformation Sects

Through the ages there were various expressions of freedom which affected the customs and laws of the state. One important development was the growth of constitutionalism which expressed itself in the signing of the Magna Carta. American civil liberties are especially indebted to the influence of certain Reformation sects of the seventeenth century. Writes Samuel Enoch Stumpf in his "Democratic Manifesto":

It is generally agreed by historians that modern liberal democracy is a product of the period of the Reformation. This is not to say the principal Reformers enunciate a clear doctrine of political democracy. "Modern democracy," writes G. P. Gooch, "is the child of the Reformation, not the reformer." Luther still considered the Church "the bulwark of political stability" and from this con-

ception it was easy to infer the doctrine of divine right and a passive obedience. Calvin was more interested in democracy than Luther (his ideal government would be "aristocracy tempered by democracy") but he did not achieve that brand of democracy in the theocracy of Geneva which his ideas were destined to evolve at a later date. . . . As Lord Acton has written, "The idea that religious liberty is the generating principle of civil, and that civil liberty is the necessary condition of the religious, was a discovery reserved for the seventeenth century."

And the seventeenth century is the period when the democratic implications of the Reformation came to fruition. By this time there had developed a "radical left wing" of the Reformation which went beyond Luther's conservative passive obedience and Calvin's theocratic notions. Such sects as the Anabaptists, Congregationalists, Independents and Quakers developed a new conception of the Church and its relation to the State which led them to strive simultaneously in the congregations as well as in civil society to embody their new views on liberty and equality. These were the groups who represented Puritanism, and it is these sects which Lord Acton has called, "the most potent agency ever brought to bear on democratic history," and about which Tawney was thinking when he wrote that "it is probable that democracy owes more to Nonconformity than to any other single movement." And Christopher Dawson has said that "in England the pure Calvinist tradition was united with that of the Anabaptist and independent sects to produce a new movement which was political as well as religious and which marks the first appearance of genuine democracy in the modern world."

The connection between Christianity and the rise of modern democracy is therefore quite clear. But what has to be borne in mind is that it was a particular type of Christianity which energized the democratic thrust. It was not Roman Catholicism, nor Anglicanism, nor Lutheranism, nor even initial Calvinism. It was a modified, left-wing Calvinism, or more general left-wing Puritanism

from which the bridge was built from Christianity to democracy.

What Mr. Stumpf says of democracy he couples with freedom. It was the independent sects of left-wing Puritanism which brought to light the implications of the Bible and Christian faith for the civil and religious liberties. This we must explore further.

Watchmen on the Wall

It has been frequently pointed out that the Puritans who came to New England sought a freedom for themselves which they denied to Roger Williams, Mrs. Hutchinson, and the Quakers. It is also important to note that there was a substantial and influential number of New England clergy in the eighteenth century who preached freedom not only from King George but from the state itself. More accurately, they taught that freedom should be written into constitutions and that such constitutions were the very basis of just government.

It was their custom to preach Election Sermons annually and these have proven a rich source for recent historians of the middle eighteenth century. In these they spelled out the implications of their study of the Bible for the civil body politic. They were undoubtedly influenced by the teaching of the deists and accepted the doctrine of Natural Rights. They were well aware of John Locke's teaching about the "social contract." But it was in the Old Testament they learned that God created man for freedom. So Samuel Webster of Salisbury, Massachusetts, declared in his Election Sermon of 1777:

No man denies but that *originally* all were equally free. Men did not purchase their freedom, nor was it the grant of kings, nor from charter, covenant, or compact, nor in any sense from men: but from God. They were born free.

Similarly, Daniel Shute of Hingham, Massachusetts, in his Election Sermon of 1768 declared: "Life, liberty, and property are the gifts of the Creator." These divines preached the "natural rights of life, liberty, and property" as part of God's created order.

They further recognized that government was established to protect these freedoms. Without law both rulers and people would be inclined to degrade their liberty to lawless ends, and to their eyes neither tyranny nor anarchy was very pleasing to God. As John Tucker of Newbury, Massachusetts, put it, "Christ came to procure liberty for his people, and to make them free in the most important sense, yet not to exempt them from subjection to civil powers, or to dissolve their obligations to one another as members of political bodies."

But government which preserved freedom was ordained of God and mediated through the people. Just government was founded on compact, which was the way in which God dealt with his church and with the state. So the Hebrew government was founded in the Old Covenant. The charters of the colonies were covenants, as were the charters for new towns. In short, all voluntary relationships were of the nature of covenants. It was by "owning the covenant" that members united with the church. Their concept of government with limited

powers, based on a covenant, was clearly stated by John Davenport in his 1669 Election Sermon before the Massachusetts Court:

Here is government set up by the people and resting upon their consent; magistrates chosen by the majority and strictly limited in power to what is allowed by God, so hedged about that their power cannot be used against the rights and liberties of the people, removable by the people if the conditions set up by them be violated. Magistrates and people are bound by law, and that law is determined by the divine law which carefully guards the rights and liberties of the people.

Constitution Makers

The preaching and teaching of Colonial clergymen laid the groundwork of ideas which became embodied in the basic documents of the new nation. As Christopher Dawson, the Roman Catholic historian, wrote in *The Judgment of the Nations*:

The Cromwellian Commonwealth . . . opened the way for a new type of civilization based on the freedom of the person and of conscience as rights conferred absolutely by God and nature. The connection is seen most clearly in America where the Congregational Calvinism of new England, which was a parallel development to the Independent Puritanism of old England, developing from the same roots in a different environment, leads on directly to the assertion of the Rights of Man in the constitu-

tions of the North American States and to the rise of political democracy.

Similarly Alice M. Baldwin writes in *New England Clergy and the American Revolution*:

There is not a right asserted in the Declaration of Independence which had not been discussed by the New England clergy before 1763. . . . It would be hard to measure the value of their service in the war. But of equal value was their help in constitution making. . . . The only way in which they could conceive of government set up by compact was through the calling of the constitutional convention. To define the natural rights retained by the people meant a bill of rights. To separate and limit the powers of each part of the government so that the rights of each should be exactly determined and carefully preserved meant the drawing up of a written constitution which could be changed only by the people themselves. The insistence of the ministers on these and other points seems to have had a decided influence on the course of events

Not only did these divines build a bridge between the Bible and the issues of their time; they fearlessly walked across it and led others to follow. This was the church influencing the pattern of society for ages to come and establishing the platform of a free society upon the certain grounds of Scripture and Christian thought. These were men who knew their responsibility as pastors to the whole community.

II. Contemporary Christian Thought

It is important not only to know the derivation of our political freedoms which come to us from the Bible through the seventeenth century Puritans but even more important to bring to bear upon our cur-

rent problems the best judgment and criticism of present-day Christian thinking. Like our predecessors we find the source and grounds for our freedom in God's gift to man. God gave us this freedom when He

made us new creatures in Jesus Christ. Through Him we share His victory over sin and death. Before Christ releases us we are bound to a dutiful fulfilling of rules and regulations, the "law." After He releases us we are free, God-loving, neighbor-serving people. This is God's gift of freedom to us—the free and loving self.

Man is free in this most essential relationship to God. He is free to pretend, to deceive himself and others, to accept or reject God Himself. Man is free to worship false gods or idolize himself. He is also free to prefer the right to the wrong, to put others ahead of self, and to worship God and Him alone. The very essence of our Christian view of man is his free self-determination. As Reinhold Niebuhr says, "His sin is the wrong use of his freedom and its consequent destruction."¹ Man's uniqueness consists in his capacity for self-transcendence. This is the basis of his freedom.

This freedom has a purpose and the purpose is love. The law of love sets men in community, makes them keenly aware of each other's needs and dignity as children of God. When freedom is under the constraint of love a man humbly receives correction from others. He experiences the forgiveness of God. Christian teaching about the universality of sin reminds us that freedom may be dreadfully misused unless we recognize the rights of others and receive their corrections. The community must provide ways in which

our freedom may be corrected and yet protected through person-to-person relationships and through government rules and regulations. The Bill of Rights sets up some "No Trespassing" signs at the boundaries of a person's freedom. Beyond this point no man or government may go.

Interdependence of Freedom and Security

If the Christian life is one of liberty to serve our neighbor, what is its relation to other important values such as Justice, Security, and Law? Eduard Heimann has pointed out the interdependence of freedom and security in these words:

Order, by definition, imposes certain limits on our freedom to act as we please and, if carried too far, degenerates into oppression and tyranny. Freedom, in turn, is a reservation exempted from the strictness of order; if it goes too far it degenerates into anarchy and chaos. . . . There cannot be individual liberty if there is no order in society, and there cannot be a durable order without a minimum of liberty.

Both freedom and order are essential to justice. If there is order without freedom there is tyranny, and no justice. If there is freedom without law and order there is anarchy, but not justice. The problem of ethics, and politics, is how to secure the best balance of these values. What combination of freedom and order will yield the just, free, and orderly society? This recognition of not one but several crucial values is important for our consideration of national security and civil liberties.

It would be generally agreed that one of the chief functions of gov-

1. *Nature and Destiny of Man*, Volume 1, page 16.

ernment is to keep order and protect the life, liberty, and property of the people. But it also has a responsibility to further just and right relations between people and groups, within and between nations. Democracy is the most workable arrangement by which freedom can be commingled with order, for in democracy government puts such checks and limits on the use of our freedom as are necessary to provide the fullest measure of freedom and opportunity for everyone. No man

can be trusted with unlimited freedom any more than he can be trusted with unlimited power. In the Christian view, unless a man is corrected by others and seeks God's forgiveness, he will misuse his freedom, and sin. Democracy is the best known device by which sinners can get along together and not forget they are sinners. Our Bill of Rights reminds us that our freedom is protected by government, limited by our neighbor's freedom, and essential to the welfare of the public.

III. Issues for Study and Action

Religious Freedom

It is a tribute to the importance of the freedom of the churches that the first section of the First Amendment to the Constitution declares: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Since that was written the "establishment" of churches in the states has ceased and there has been no effort on the part of the federal government toward such an "esabllishment." Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths are all parts of the religious heritage of America. The three faiths get along best when they do not strive for domination of each other or seek special favors from the state. Such discrimination does arise from time to time, as Frank Ketcham's brief on the First Amendment points out.²

The important efforts should be

2. Obtainable from the Council for Social Action.

to work out ways for the three faiths to get along harmoniously and to work together at the common problems facing the nation.³ Religious and civil liberties ought to make common cause more frequently, for they are interdependent and indivisible. The insecurity of any cultural, racial, or religious minority menaces the security of all. When churches pay attention to civil liberties they safeguard religious freedom and when they protect their religious freedom they champion civil liberty as well.

Separation of Powers

The Constitution provides for separation of powers between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of government.

3. Those who desire to study this problem further will find much help in the study pamphlet of the Department of Religious Liberty of the National Council of Churches entitled, "Church and State," by Claud D. Nelson.

This is a device designed to prevent the exercise of arbitrary power. One of the proper functions of the legislative branch is to investigate. It is necessary that Congressional committees study the effects of legislation and the need for new legislation. When the purpose becomes "exposure" of persons or organizations, however, it encroaches on the functions of the executive and judicial branches. When exposure results in political profit the temptation is too great for some investigators to resist. As previously pointed out, some committees are adopting rules conforming to the time-honored practices of the courts which both protect the persons involved and disclose the truth. By and large the detection and punishment of crime rest with the executive and judicial branches of government. Support of the F.B.I. and other investigatory agencies of government and the encouragement of the courts in their judicial role will contribute both to national security and to civil liberties. Recommendations for fair practices for investigatory committees should be studied carefully to give wise public support for needed improvement in state legislatures and Congress.

Clear Definition of the Crime

There is an old legal maxim that "where the law is uncertain there is no law." Both definitions and the accusations must be precise enough so that a reasonable man can understand them. The Sixth Amendment provides, among other things, that the accused shall "be informed of the nature and cause of the accu-

sation." The Truman Loyalty Order of 1947 defined disloyalty in terms of treason, sabotage, espionage, crimes against the national security, and "sympathetic affiliation" with any organization listed by the Attorney General as subversive. But the Attorney General's list was published many years after some people had such "sympathetic affiliation." Meanwhile the purposes and practices, as well as the control, might have changed. It might not have been clear to them at the time that their affiliations would become questionable at a later date. Indeed, it is not clear today what organizations a future Attorney General might add to some future list.

The Eisenhower Security Order of 1953 added the category of "security risk." The administrators may have had a clear definition of "security risk," but in the public mind it was confused with disloyalty and similarly "punished" by public opinion. Vagueness of definition violates the spirit, if not the letter, of "due process." Clearer ideas on the part of the public and clearer definitions on the part of government are needed.

Presumption of Guilt

The associations a person has are an important way of judging him. People are judged "good" by association as well as "guilty." The problem in "guilt by association" lies in how the presumption of guilt relates to the facts of his association. Is there reasonable ground to presume guilt because of the facts? Does the accused have adequate information about who accuses him

and what the charges are? Does he have a fair chance to rebut the charge by facing his accuser?

The secrecy sometimes insisted upon makes it impossible for the accused to make the rebuttal. The Yarmolinsky studies give a number of such instances.⁴ On December 16, 1955, the *New York Post* reported that eight Americans — former prisoners of war in Korea — who had been honorably discharged or who had re-enlisted had been accused of giving aid and comfort to the enemy. The government could not tell them what disloyal acts they were said to have committed, who accused them, where the offenses occurred, or when they happened; but they were required to defend themselves against the charges. The man who held the hearings informed them the files had been declared "top secret" and he could not release them. "There is nothing I can do or the commission can do but proceed within the framework of our limitations." Only under the rarest circumstances involving national security should such limitations be recognized. The right of rebuttal on the part of the accused is an essential part of the process for determining whether there are reasonable grounds for the presumption of guilt.

The presumption of guilt, at least in the public mind, is sometimes established by citing a list of organizations with which the accused was associated at one time. The dates of

such associations are important. In 1944 Generals Marshall, MacArthur, Pershing, Clark, and Eisenhower sent congratulatory messages to the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship, which is now on the Attorney General's list. The public often equates accusation with guilt. To be "cited" by the Un-American Activities Committee or some other group puts upon a man a stigma he may carry the rest of his life.

Guilt by Parallelism

To establish a presumption of guilt there must be a logical connection between the facts and the inference. A few years ago the views of the CSA on a dozen national issues were listed in parallel columns with those of the C.I.O., the Methodist Federation for Social Action, and the Communist Party. If the Democratic and Republican Party platforms had been listed they also would have been parallel at many points, and by selection of issues it would have been possible to show complete parallelism. This is known in logic as the fallacy of the undisputed middle.

Nor is there a logical connection between the fact that a man criticizes a committee investigating communism and the presumption that he is a communist sympathizer. When Mr. J. Parnell Thomas was a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee he said: "Anyone who opposes the work of this Committee is un-American." Criticism of government, or any of its agencies and personnel, does not make one disloyal by any standard. Similarly, to use the Fifth Amend-

4. Adam Yarmolinsky, *Case Studies in Personnel Security* (Washington: The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., 1955).

ment, even though such use may seem ill-advised or evasive, should not establish a presumption of guilt. It will be a service to government and civil liberties to encourage clearer thinking on the part of the public as to how guilt is established.

Loyalty Oaths

Swearing to support the Constitution does not involve any problem for civil liberties. What does raise problems is the "test oath" which requires sworn statements of one's past affiliation with organizations on the Attorney General's list and imposes certain punishments for refusal to take the oath. For example, the Gwinn Amendment to the Federal Housing Act requires all occupants to take such an oath on the theory, as Congressman Gwinn stated it, that "public housing breeds Communism." Many states require such test oaths for teachers, and refusal to take the oath may result in dismissal. Some states re-

quire such oaths of public employees, authors and publishers of textbooks (Texas), persons holding insurance licenses (District of Columbia), public accountants (New York), persons eligible for unemployment compensation (Ohio), wrestlers and prize fighters (Indiana), and students in state universities (Texas). In 1952 California required such an oath of persons and organizations enjoying tax exemption, which, of course, included the churches.

These issues are but a few of the many raised by efforts to protect both national security and civil liberties. Christian faith does not give precise and conclusive answers or solutions. It does impel us to find answers which will preserve both the freedom of the person and the security of the society. One of the great services the churches can render in these days is to build bridges between their faith and civil liberties. The following proposals are designed to help in building these bridges.

IV. Church Programs for Civil Liberties

One of the most important contributions the churches make to civil liberties is to develop in each local church a community of people who trust each other. The Lucknow Study Conference of 1952 declared: "The Church's aim should be to build up cells of true community-living as a means of humanizing the impersonal relationships of modern societies." This "humanizing" begins within the fellowship of the church which provides opportunity for dis-

cussion of social issues. A leader in the East German churches reported that the presence of informers had threatened the mutual confidence of the members until they decided they would trust each other in spite of informers. Only in such a community of trust could they preserve their souls and their social conscience. When the church provides such a community there can be a confident discussion of civic problems and civil liberties. "True community-liv-

ing" means that the church will support the more adventurous members who speak up on controversial matters.

The Witness of the Local Church

It is in the local community that many of the victories for civil liberties must be won. It is there that self-appointed private groups and organizations exert pressure upon school teachers, librarians, preachers, and community leaders. When these pressures are out in the open they can be countered by an informed public opinion. It is much more difficult when an undisclosed or private investigating group distributes derogatory information.

In addition to these suggestions, the church can sponsor programs which will bring these problems to the attention of its own members and the community. The Council for Social Action has prepared a packet of suggestions for worship, preaching, and meetings, entitled "Christian Faith and Freedom." A leaflet announcing the "inquiry into the bearing of Christian faith upon our civil liberties" is available for distribution to the members and for information about the resources available. Congregational Christian Churches are invited to discuss a draft statement on "Christian Faith and Freedom" prepared by a special commission under the chairmanship of Albert T. Rasmussen of Colgate-Rochester Divinity School. After study and revision the statement will go to the General Council for its consideration in June, 1956.

State-Wide Church Programs

Many states have enacted loyalty oaths and initiated investigations and other programs designed to protect security. The churches, through their state organizations, have given attention to such problems through study of fundamental rights and liberties and also through analysis of proposals for state legislation. A good example of the former was the program packet of the Massachusetts Council of Churches in 1952, "Constitutional Rights and Liberties." It contained the Bill of Rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a leader's guide for seven discussions, a true-false test, and materials on the Biblical roots of freedom. It was widely used throughout the state and beyond.

In some states, as in Massachusetts, there is a special committee of the churches charged with responsibility to analyze proposals for state legislation and make the information available to the churches. The legislative bulletin, issued each month when the state legislature is in session, has a special section on "Constitutional Rights and Liberties." In other states special seminars are held in which church members can hear the views of legislators on such topics and discuss with them the problems involved. Still other church organizations publish occasional newsletters or information sheets on civil liberties issues. As in the local community, such church organizations frequently cooperate with non-church state-wide groups in securing and distributing authoritative opinions and facts.

National Church Programs

Many Protestant communions have passed resolutions, formed committees, and conducted programs of study and action in this area. The National Council of Churches in March, 1953, adopted a statement on maintaining freedom and set up a Committee on the Maintenance of American Freedom. The General Board adopted a statement on procedural abuses by Congressional Committees (March, 1954), on Federal Aid to Education (May, 1954), and on Religious and Civil Liberties (October, 1955). One of the departments of its Division of Life and Work is that of Religious Liberty. Dr. Claud D. Nelson is the executive secretary and the Rt. Rev. Malcolm E. Peabody is the chairman. Although the department does not have special responsibility for civil liberties, it finds no clear division between these and religious liberties since other liberties are included in the First Amendment in the Bill of Rights. The Division also appointed in 1953 a Committee on the Church and Civic and Political Life, which has been considering civil liberties in its study of the churches' responsibility for civic and political affairs.

The social education and action agencies of the denominations cooperate with the National Council of Churches in conducting an annual Churchmen's Washington Seminar in the nation's capital, usually in February. Civil liberties and problems of security are given special attention. This year these agencies have published jointly a leaflet on election issues, "Questions for

Christians." The Methodist Board of Social and Economic Relations produced a 40-minute motion picture, *Sound of a Stone*, showing a teacher accused of using a subversive book. The Council for Social Action is distributing a number of films as part of the program in the Congregational Christian Churches. Many of the questions raised in this article are discussed at greater length, and some not raised here are considered in the book written by Frank D. Dorey entitled *Christian Faith and American Freedom*.

Christians and Civil Liberties

Christians should be most sensitive about civil and religious liberties because of what happened to Jesus. When his opponents became aroused they brought against him the power of the state. There were no "rights" which he could claim for his protection against the state, and the established procedures for trial miscarried. The early Christians were persecuted because they would not swear their loyalty to Caesar. In the Inquisition heretics were "investigated," often with gross miscarriage of justice. It was in revolt against the tyranny of king and people that our forefathers established our nation with a written Constitution and required that there be added to it a Bill of Rights.

We would be proven to be negligent of our faith and derelict in our duty if we did less than our best to understand, defend, and extend these God-given, government-guarded liberties, our most precious freedom.

"Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty."

Book Notes . . .

THE CHRISTIAN AS CITIZEN, by John C. Bennett. Association Press, 1955. \$1.25.

This short book is one of the World Christian Books sponsored by the International Missionary Council. It is written therefore for a world-wide Christian audience. Dr. Bennett has succeeded remarkably well in writing a simple, readable, and objective statement of some of the implications of Christian faith for citizenship in the modern world. He traces clearly the relationship of Christian faith to political decisions and effectively relates the individual Christian to political authority and political structures. His brief chapter on communism is excellent. Those who seek an elaboration at this point may consult his earlier book, *Christianity and Communism*, Association Press, 1948.

* * *

FREEDOM'S HOLY LIGHT, by Merrimon Cuninggim. Harper and Brothers, 1955. \$2.75.

The Dean of Perkins School of Theology has provided the best popular treatment of the church-and-state issue published in recent years. The early part of the volume gives very helpful treatment of the meaning of freedom and shows the development of the idea of freedom within Christianity. After carefully tracing this history of religious freedom in America the author develops his argument for independence of church and state with

By Frank D. Dorey

Associate Professor of Social Ethics at Howard University

provision for voluntary cooperation in areas of joint concern and responsibility. Readers interested in the thorny problem of defining a realistic relationship in this difficult area may also wish to consult an excellent article in the December, 1955, issue of the *Political Science Quarterly* entitled "Toward a Modern Theory of Church-State Relationships." The author presents the case for partial separation.

* * *

THE URGE TO PERSECUTE, by A. Powell Davies. Beacon Press, 1953. \$2.75.

From the vantage point of his Unitarian pulpit in the nation's capital, Dr. Davies issues a blistering attack upon the worst abuses of some Congressional investigations and operations of the government security program. There are some prophetic insights and a fearless attempt to read "the handwriting on the wall." It is popular in style and somewhat sermonic, but good medicine for the complacent.

* * *

CHRISTIANITY, COMMUNISM AND HISTORY, by William Hordern. Abingdon Press, 1954. \$2.50.

An excellent book for those who are eager to understand why Christianity and communism are rivals for the loyalty of mankind. Dr. Hordern provides a thought provoking comparison of the Christian and communist interpretations of history. He sees communism as a religion or rather a pseudo-religion

which perverts the universal hunger for the good life. Most significant and most challenging is his insistence that Christianity has an answer to communism far superior to the reliance upon military might and superficial propaganda.

* * *

DEMOCRACY AND THE CHURCHES, by James H. Nichols. Westminster Press, 1951. \$4.50.

This is still the best scholarly treatment of the relationship of the traditions of the Free Churches to the growth of American democracy. It is exhaustively documented and the notes give a rich and comprehensive picture of the entire literature dealing with the theme. It is somewhat difficult reading but well worth dipping into and using as a reference.

* * *

CHRISTIAN REALISM AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS, by Reinhold Niebuhr. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. \$3.00.

This is a collection of essays. Three are of particular help for those interested in civil liberties. These chapters are "Why is Communism so Evil?" "Democracy, Secularism, and Christianity," and "The Christian Witness in the Social and National Order."

* * *

I PROTEST, by G. Bromley Oxnam. Harper and Brothers, 1954. \$2.50.

The well-known Methodist bishop describes here his experiences with the House Un-American Activities Committee. The reader gets an inside view of the treatment the bishop received and his reactions.

* * *

THE CHURCH IN COMMUNITY ACTION, by Harvey Seifert. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1952. \$2.40.

This is a type of handbook which should be read by all who believe in social action. There are three chapters which will prove particularly helpful in promoting discussion and action in the field of civil liberties. These chapters deal with "Meeting Opposition Creatively," "Techniques for Social Education," and "Political Activities for Churchmen."

* * *

A DEMOCRATIC MANIFESTO, by Samuel Enoch Stumpf. Vanderbilt University Press, 1954. \$2.75.

Although some timid souls may be scared away by an unfortunate title, this is really an excellent little book. The author is trained both as a lawyer and as a theologian, and has taught both law and theology at Vanderbilt University. He does in a simple, readable manner what Dr. Nichols does in a more exhaustive way for the contribution of left-wing Puritanism to American democracy. The style is clear and direct and will be most helpful to laymen, particularly where Mr. Stumpf deals with complex theological ideas in everyday language.

* * *

DECLARATION OF FREEDOM, by Elton Trueblood. Harper and Brothers, 1955. \$1.50.

Popularly written, this book has had a wide appeal to laymen. In the framework of the current world struggle the author discusses the nature of freedom and equality and relates these concepts to basic Christian and democratic assertions of the dignity of each individual human being in the sight of God.

Christian Faith and Freedom

Program Suggestions for use in Churches

By Fern Babcock

Program Secretary, Council for Social Action

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND FREEDOM is one of the four current program emphases recommended to churches by the Council for Social Action. New resource materials are available which will assist the minister and other leaders in developing this emphasis.

The CSA is able to provide informative and interesting study-discussion materials because of a generous grant from the Fund for the Republic. Other denominations which have received similar grants and which are developing local programs are the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church U.S.A., the Presbyterian Church U.S., and the Universalist Church of America. The American Friends Service Committee has also received a grant for work in the field of civil liberties.

The open, free society of America has been severely challenged in the decade since World War II. Certain restrictions have been placed on our constitutional rights of free speech, press, and assembly; but most of us have acquiesced because the security of our nation has been endangered. Our way of life has been threatened from the outside by the "Cold War" with the Soviet Union and from the inside by communist sabotage and by powerful reactionary forces seeking to dominate the country.

The time has come for Christians to look deeply into the nature of freedom, to understand the contribution made by the Judeo-Christian faith to American freedom, and to see whether our free society jeopardizes or enhances national security. As Christians, we have the responsibility to use our God-given freedom and to defend the right of others to do so.

Plan the Program

A planning committee should be selected to survey the status of civil liberties in the community, to study the bearing of Christian faith upon freedom, and to develop a program adapted to the particular needs and resources of the church.

The planning committee for the Christian Faith and Freedom project might represent the various fellowships within the church and include persons in a position to know about Christian faith and civil liberties.

The planning committee might begin its work together by studying the program suggestions contained in the *CSA Packet on Christian Faith and Freedom*.¹ It might then read the resource booklets in the *Packet* and some of the books recommended in the *Bibliography*.

1. Available from the CSA for \$1.00.

Assess the Status of Civil Liberties

Does the community encourage the free, open discussion of ideas important enough to be considered controversial? Or have citizens become overly cautious and afraid to speak their minds?

Members of the planning committee might conduct an informal survey of the condition of civil liberty in the community, using the suggestions contained in the *Packet*.

Preach Sermons

Ask the minister to preach on Christian Faith and Freedom and use the great music and prayers on Christian liberty in services of worship. Resources for worship prepared by Reverend Mrs. Robert L. Edwards will be found in the *Packet*. Books on Christianity and Freedom are listed in the *Bibliography*. A stimulating article on "The Form of Christian Freedom" by Daniel Day Williams appears in *Advance* for January 25, 1956.

Study the Policy Statement

One of the policy statements which the CSA will submit to the General Council at Omaha in June is on Christian Faith and Freedom. A commission of thirty distinguished Congregational Christians, with Dr. Albert T. Rasmussen as chairman, has prepared the first draft of the statement. Copies will be sent to each church for study and comment. The commission will revise its statement in the light of suggestions from the churches and submit it to the General Council for amendment and adoption.

Introduce the Inquiry

The planning committee may decide to concentrate its program on Christian Faith and Freedom during March, April, and May; or it may prefer to continue this emphasis throughout 1956. It will want to find the best ways to introduce the inquiry to the entire church.

Copies of the introductory leaflet "Christian Faith and Freedom" are available free from the CSA in quantities sufficient for distribution at a Sunday service or for including in a mailing to members of the church.

The committee might decide to plan an introductory meeting on Christian Faith and Freedom at a church night dinner. Program Leaflet I in the *Packet* gives detailed suggestions for developing one or more of the following ideas in an introductory meeting of the entire church or of one of the fellowship groups:

Produce the skit *Freedom's Holy Light* by Herman F. Reissig. Follow the skit with a discussion of the contribution of Christian faith to the development of civil liberty in America.

Show the film *The Sound of a Stone*. Follow it with a discussion of the responsibility of Christians to come to the defense of persons whose reputations are attacked.

Present a speaker on Christian Faith and Freedom, followed by a forum.

Study the Biblical Sources of Freedom using the guide by Ralph Douglas Hyslop in the *Packet*.

Discuss Christian Faith and the Bill of Rights, using a discussion starter of true and false statements.

The committee will want to plan for lively discussion in the Pilgrim Fellowship, the United Student Fellowship, the Couples Club, the Women's Fellowship, the Laymen's Fellowship, and the Church School. The *Packet* gives detailed suggestions for planning meetings in these groups on the following subjects:

Totalitarian Threats to American Freedom

National Security and Personal Freedom

Freedom for Research and Teaching

Totalitarian Threats to American Freedom

A titanic struggle is being waged in the world between totalitarian forces that seek to control the masses of the people and democratic forces which maintain that "government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Two major forms of totalitarianism seek to control the peoples of the world: fascism and communism.

Program Leaflet II in the *Packet* suggests that church groups consider the essential differences between communism, fascism, and democracy; see how they operate in other countries and in the U.S.A.; and consider the responsibility of Christians in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. The leaflet gives detailed suggestions for using one or more of these ideas in developing a meeting on "Totalitarian Threats to American Freedom":

A speech by one who has lived in a fascist or communist country on

"What Does it Mean to Live under a Totalitarian Government?"

Review, or give a reading from, the book *Darkness at Noon* by Arthur Koestler.

Show the film *What Price Freedom* and discuss the nature of Christian freedom.

Present a speaker on "Communist Activity in the U.S.A." followed by a discussion of how we can combat communism and preserve our civil liberties.

Hold a study conference on "Christian Encounter with Revolution," using *Encounter with Revolution* by M. Richard Shaull.

National Security and Personal Freedom

Since World War II several practices have developed in the effort to combat fascism and communism which jeopardize civil liberties.

Program Leaflet III gives suggestions for planning a meeting on "National Security and Personal Freedom," using one or more of these ideas:

Present a speaker who will discuss National Security and Personal Freedom.

Show the film *Lt. Radulovich Versus the Air Force*, which depicts Edward R. Murrow's interview with Lt. Radulovich.

Role-play a situation which could happen in your community depicting the conflict between loyalty-security programs of federal agencies and the rights of individuals.

Invite a Congressman to speak on "Congress, Personal Freedom, and National Security" and answer questions asked by a *meet-the-press* type of panel.

Freedom of Research and Teaching

Program Leaflet IV suggests that groups in the church plan a program to show: (1) why the discovery of new truth is dependent on the freedom of research and teaching; and (2) the responsibility of churches for helping to maintain this freedom. Different ways to develop the program are to:

Show the film *Freedom to Learn*, produced by the National Education Association.

Review the booklet *Academic Freedom and Academic Responsibility* of the ACLU.

Ask the United Student Fellowship or the Student YMCA and YWCA of a nearby college to come

to the church for a discussion of academic freedom.

Citadel of Freedom

Church-wide discussion of Christian Faith and Freedom will do much to help us understand our responsibility for the use and defense of freedom. Church members will see that Congregational Christian churches have the opportunity to be citadels of democracy today, just as they did in those days when our nation was struggling for independence.

The church will be effective as a citadel of freedom if it selects three to ten persons and charges them with the task of encouraging church members to use their freedom responsibly and to come to the defense of those whose freedom is jeopardized.

Resources

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A selected listing of books and pamphlets. Free.

POLICY STATEMENT: A draft statement prepared by the Commission on Christian Faith and Freedom. Free upon request.

PACKET on Christian Faith and Freedom: Contains background information, suggestions for sermons, and proposed programs for use in the various fellowships of the churches, including films, role-playing, book reviews, speeches and worship. \$1.00.

FILMS: The CSA has purchased copies of several excellent films for use in the discussion of civil liberties. Write to the Missions Council Library at 14 Beacon Street, Boston 8, Mass.; 287 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y.; or 19 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill.; or to your own State Conference office. These films are available for a minimal service charge and postage.

BOOK: *Christian Faith and American Freedom* by Frank D. Dorey. Five chapters with questions and suggestions for further reading. \$1.00.

MAGAZINE: "This Freedom of Ours" by F. Ernest Johnson, in *Social Action* for November, 1953. Single copy, 25 cents.

WORKSHOP

Edited by
Herman F. Reissig

Calling All Churches!

Fellow Congregationalists, we have before us a chance to do something significant. It is, in a word, a chance to bring out of the next meeting of the General Council of Congregational Christian Churches (Omaha, June 20-27) resolutions on social issues that will have weight and wisdom. To help make this chance a reality you need not be a delegate, or even a visitor, to the General Council meeting. Every church and every member can participate.

Here is the story. Resolutions on social problems adopted by conventions are often unsatisfactory. They are hurriedly put together; they represent the opinion of only the minority that has paid close attention; there is little grass-roots character about them; sometimes they are adopted, or pushed through, when the delegates are tired or when many of them have gone home. Yet most of us feel that a great church convention ought not to meet without saying something to show how Christians feel about foreign policy, race relations, civil liberties. Recognizing this need and the weakness of the usual resolutions, the General Council's Program Committee (acting with the authority of the Executive Committee) has decided upon

the following procedure for the Omaha meeting.

Churches to Participate

1. The CSA has been asked to prepare draft resolutions on international relations, race relations, and civil liberties. This has been done. The CSA's International Relations Committee, the Race Relations Department, and a special national Commission on Christian Faith and Freedom have prepared statements on these three subjects.

2. The draft statements, or resolutions, are to be sent to every church. They should be received about March 1. If you are a lay leader ask your minister if he has them.

3. Every church is urged to discuss the draft statements. This may be done in the regular organizations or in a series of two or three meetings set up for this purpose. Social Action Committees might spend the March or April meeting analyzing the statements. But, wherever possible, draw in additional people. What is important is not the number who take part but the seriousness of the discussion. If you wish more explanation of some of the statements—more facts, more background—write to the CSA, stating your specific requirements. The CSA

will respond quickly. The drafts can provide exciting discussion and some real education in your church. Make careful note of all agreed-upon criticisms. A form will be provided for this. If you feel strongly that something should be said on a subject omitted in the drafts, prepare a short statement on it.

4. Draft resolutions are to be returned to the CSA by *May 15*. The CSA will then—still following Program Committee directives—rewrite the statements, to the best of its ability taking account of your criticisms.

5. Early in the General Council meeting there will be an Open Hearing, presided over by the Moderator or someone appointed by him. This will make possible further explanation and discussion.

6. On Saturday afternoon, June 23, the General Council will meet in plenary session for the express purpose of acting on the statements on social issues, the final drafts having been previously given to all delegates and visitors.

6. This process does not rule out the submission of resolutions originating with a church, an association, a conference or an individual. Such resolutions may be sent to the CSA or to the General Council Resolutions Committee. The latter will turn over to the CSA for processing any resolutions on social issues it receives.

Why CSA Was Designated

The Acting Minister of the General Council, Dr. Buschmeyer, says that the CSA, as the General Coun-

cil's chief agent in dealing with social issues, seems the logical agency for helping the General Council express itself in this field. The Resolutions Committee will have its hands full with the many other matters on which it will be desired that the General Council speak. But this does not mean that the social issues statements will be presented to the General Council as from the CSA. The CSA is only acting as initiator of the process and as a kind of preparatory and steering committee. It will have, it goes without saying, no veto power over anything the churches and the delegates wish to say.

Don't You Agree?

If hundreds of our churches and thousands of persons cooperate we shall be engaging in a truly democratic procedure and the result should be the adoption of statements that will command attention and that will be helpful to individual members, to the churches, and to the CSA. Since some will remember, it should be added that something like this process was begun two years ago, with many local churches loyally cooperating. Things bogged down then at the General Council meeting. This time all responsible officers are alerted. Now, for the next two and a half months, it's up to you.

Isn't It Fun?

If you, as an American, are afraid to speak out and speak up, in fear of public opinion or of some self-appointed subversion hunters or of a Congressional committee, that's no fun. If you are wrongfully accused

of harboring dangerous ideas or of associating with a subversive organization, there's no fun in that. A scared American is something for tears. But if all the talk about freedom and denials of freedom leads you to dig around in the subject, starts you on an investigation of what our civil liberties really are, where they came from, and how they can be defended, that can be the kind of fun that sets your mind and your blood racing. We didn't know when we started out on the CSA's "Christian Faith and Freedom" emphasis that it was going to be so exciting. Some of us even wondered if it wasn't going to be a little dull, now that McCarthyism has passed its peak and Americans are once more beginning to act like adults (not all of them, of course!). We may have thought the battle was finished just when we were rushing to the ramparts.

But it isn't like that. For one thing, there is still enough McCarthyism in the land. Far too much! And let's not be complacent about the future! The international tension could mount again and the wrong people could once more find their way to positions of power. The kind of freedom Americans, at their best, believe in is never safe. And, then, some of us are discovering depths and meanings in the field of freedom we didn't know were there. Mr. Preacher, how long has it been since you read a book, say, like *Seed-time of the Republic*, by Clinton Rossiter and preached a sermon in the great pulpit tradition of 17th century Thomas Hooker of Hartford? Have you wrestled with the

question of how "the freedom wherewith Christ made us free" is related to American freedom? They're not quite the same thing but there's a connection. How about a sermon in Lent that exposes the religious roots of freedom? The CSA has a wealth of material for you. One dollar will bring the packet, "Christian Faith and Freedom."

And for Discussion Groups

You've had Ray Gibbons and Fern Babcock working like Trojans on materials about freedom, and social action workers from many states meeting with them in New York to make suggestions, and Frank Dorey writing a book about it, and a national commission laboring on a statement to go up to General Council. And it's all ready now. We Congregational Christians can do a real job of making freedom's tree bear richer fruit. **WRITE TODAY FOR THAT PACKET!** Let's have a revival. Let's build in our churches a solid block of people who can, in the name of American freedom, stand up to both communists and the extremists at the other end, who, for freedom's sake, play fast and loose with its very essence!

Good Old Emerson!

At the Framingham Social Action Institute last July Myron Fowell and Galen Weaver let up on us for a half-day and told us to go sightseeing. A few of us went over to Concord and looked at the place "where once the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard round the world." And then we went to the house where Ralph Wal-

do Emerson lived and blew on his trumpet. We need his courage today and his insistence that the American is a person who stands up firm and straight. "Whoso would be a man," said Emerson, "let him be a non-conformist!" That, we should not forget, is in the great American tradition. If you think a discussion on civil liberties is too hot for your church, repeat Emerson's words six times before going to bed — and when you get up in the morning order the CSA's packet, "Christian Faith and Freedom" (\$1.00).

Quote — For Calendar or Sermon

"When trust and confidence are restored and the right of criticism and dissent is again accepted as a traditional right, the belief in the power of knowledge and freedom will shine again for the world to see. How else shall our children learn the moral values of courage, independence, charity, and justice, if opportunities are not offered for seeking their own personal convictions of truth through free discussion and inquiry?

"We have long and hard work to do to create the kind of society in which FREE men can live creatively. . . . When men have let themselves worry too long about real or threatened ills, when they have drugged themselves with bad medicine, they may well need a tonic before they can put themselves with full vigor into the tasks they see ahead. Christians have such a tonic: 'Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.' " (From "FREEDOM — A Summary Report on our 1955 Study" issued by the Christian Citi-

zenship Committee of the First Congregational Church of Darien, Connecticut, Alfred G. H. Schmalz, minister.) A stirring document! Why should not many churches produce something like it?

Here It Is Again

Do you want a UN Institute for your church, such as described in the January issue of WORKSHOP? The time of the International Relations secretary is getting filled up for the next six months, but he will try to help you if you want to do a real job on the UN.

"I'd Give My Eye Teeth"

That's what one man said when we told him about the CSA's 1956 Study and Travel Seminar and invited him to join. (I never did know for sure what eye teeth are or if there are such things. Will a dentist please enlighten me?) Since this is being written on February 16th, we can't tell whether the quota of 25 will be full when you read it. France, Germany, Russia, Finland, Sweden, Holland, England! Out in Ohio a church gave its minister a present of \$1700 and told him to join us. A great thing for a church to do! They won't regret it.

Workshop is reprinted from SOCIAL ACTION magazine for distribution to social action committee members and others in Congregational Christian churches by the:

Council for Social Action
289 Fourth Avenue
New York 10, N.Y.

THE RESPONSIBLE SOCIETY

Man is created and called to be a free being, responsible to God and his neighbour. Any tendencies in State and society depriving man of the possibility of acting responsibly are a denial of God's intention for man and His work of salvation. A responsible society is one where freedom is the freedom of men who acknowledge responsibility to justice and public order, and where those who hold political authority or economic power are responsible for its exercise to God and the people whose welfare is affected by it.

We therefore condemn:

1. Any attempt to limit the freedom of the Church to witness to its Lord and His design for mankind and any attempt to impair the freedom of men to obey God and to act according to conscience, for those freedoms are implied in man's responsibility before God;
2. Any denial to man of an opportunity to participate in the shaping of society, for this is a duty implied in man's responsibility towards his neighbour;
3. Any attempt to prevent men from learning and spreading the truth.

From *Statements of the World Council of Churches on Social Questions* (Section III of "The Message of the First Assembly of the World Council of Churches — Amsterdam, 1948"), p. 19.